



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## II.—PROVERBS AND TALES COMMON TO THE TWO SANSKRIT EPICS.

In the long chapter on the duties of kings, of which I spoke in my last paper, there is a proverb which appears in Gorresio's text, ii. 109. 58, in the form

*yāni mithyābhiṣastānām patanty aṣrūṇi rodatām  
tāni putra paṣūn ghnanti teṣām mithyābhiṣaṁsinām,*

that is: "The tears of them who weep on being falsely accused destroy, my son, the cattle of them who falsely accuse." The corresponding portion of the section in the Mahābhārata has no such proverb, but the alternate text of the Rāmāyaṇa not only has the proverb but, as it were, fits it more snugly into its present place by reading *Rāghava* at the end of the first line. Turning now to an entirely different part of the Mahābhārata we find the original, or the nearest approach to the original that we are likely to discover. In this older and freer form the proverb has no vocative at all, and indeed the particular vocative *putra* in the Rāmāyaṇa is suspicious enough in itself, as Rāma generally addresses Bharata either with *tāta* or by name or title. The fact that the proverb is outside of the *kaccit* interrogatives and that it is an independent verse in the Mahābhārata without any form of address shows us pretty plainly what has happened. In the first place, one of the countless floating proverbs of the age is caught up and preserved in Mbh. xii. 91. 20 in an impersonal form: "The tears of them who weep on being falsely accused destroy the sons and cattle of those (accusers) in consequence of the false accusation."<sup>1</sup> The *kaccit* chapter of the Mahābhārata has not yet taken up this bit of wisdom, but the Rāmāyaṇa first adopts it by changing *putrān* to *putra*, and then the secondary text, which, as I showed in my last paper, is in this instance the Bombay version, adopts it still further by altering *rodatām* to *Rāghava*; so that in the end the verse has quite the appearance of being at home, when

<sup>1</sup> For *putra* of R. C. and B., M. has *putrān*; for B.'s genitive, M. has the abl. *mithyābhiṣaṁsanāt*, while R. C. reads *prityartham anuṣāsatāḥ*.

we hear Rāma cite it in his usual patronizing way, beginning : " Yes, Rāghava, my boy, the tears," etc.

Just as the phraseology of both epics is in great part identical, so also the proverbial substratum is, as we should expect, more or less the same, and there cannot be much doubt that both epics drew on the same material, besides adding each to its own store. A favorite method of doing this is to take up the original proverb and then repeat it in a different form, modifying it somewhat in each new casting. A review of the proverbs common to both epics forms a sort of corollary to a review of the phraseology, and in some cases it is actually difficult to say whether we are handling the wreck of a proverb or merely an identical *pāda*-phrase.

There are, of course, in the Rāmāyaṇa, as in the Mahābhārata, many proverbs which appear first again in much later literature and not at all in the other epic. Such, for example, is the *lokapravāda* cited B. iii. 59. 16 : " He that is about to die smells not the smell of an expiring lamp (*dīpanirvāṇa*), hears not a friend's words, and sees not the star Arundhatī." This turns up in the Hitopadeṣa, but appears to be as yet unknown to the Mahābhārata. But even the introductory phrase *loka-pravāda*, instead of the simpler term employed in the Mahābhārata, points to a later stage.<sup>1</sup>

One of these proverbs akin to the last embodies the oft-repeated warning against " seeing golden trees," which seems to be a special application of the more general proverb known to classical antiquity as *quos deus perdere vult dementat prius*. The relation of the two epics to these proverbs is not without interest. At the meeting of the Oriental Society in Baltimore, in October, 1887, I pointed out the extraordinary verbal resemblance of the Greek, Latin and Sanskrit proverbs, as the last is found in the Mahābhārata, ii. 81. 8 and v. 34. 81, where the wording is :

*yasmāi devāḥ prayacchanti puruṣāya parābhavam  
buddhiṃ tasyā 'pakarṣanti so 'vācīnāni paçyati,*

" For whatsoever man the gods prepare the overthrow, they take away his senses, and he sees things inverted." This is evidently, however, the same proverb with that which appears in the Rāmāyaṇa, iii. 56. 16 ; B. iii. 62. 20-21 :

<sup>1</sup> The word *gāthā* is also used for a proverbial stanza. Thus in R. B. vi. 110. 2 : *pāurāṇī cāi 'va gāthe 'yaṃ lāukikī pratibhātī me, eti jīvantam ānando naraṃ varṣaṭātād āpi*. C. reads *kalyāṇī bata*.

*yadā vināṣakālo vāi lakṣyate dāivanirmitaḥ  
tadā vāi viparīteṣu manaḥ prakurute naraḥ,*

"When the time of destruction ordained by Fate is remarked, then the man sets his mind on things inverted." Here *viparīta* is synonymous with *avācīna*. It is this former word which the Mahābhārata itself employs in the proverb of the golden trees, vi. 98. 17:

*mumūrṣur hi naraḥ sarvān vṛkṣān paṣyati kāñcanān  
tathā tvam api Gāndhāre viparītāni paṣyasi,*

"The man that is about to die forsooth sees golden trees; so thou too, Gāndhāri, seest inverted," i. e. incorrectly. This is further explained by the preceding verse: "Through thy confusion of mind, *mohāt*, thou knowest not what should be said and should not be said." Thus when this proverb appears by inference in the Rāmāyaṇa, we read C. iii. 53. 17-19:

17. *mṛtyukāle yathā martyo viparītāni sevate*

*mumūrṣūṇāṁ tu sarveṣāṁ yat paṭhyam tan na rocate*

19. *vyaktaṁ hiraṇmayāṁ tvam hi saṁpaṣyasi mahīruhān*

(B. 59. 19: *nūnaṁ hiraṇmayān mohāt tvam paṣyasi mahīruhān*),

"As at the time of death a mortal observes things inverted, but nothing that is suitable pleases any that are about to die; so thou forsooth plainly seest golden trees." The vision of golden trees is then a special form of the general 'inverted' or crooked sight which presages death. This allusion to the golden vision is as common in the Rāmāyaṇa as it is rare in the Mahābhārata. The former epic has many passages implying it. Thus in R. C. iii. 68. 11:

*uparudhyanti me prāṇā dr̥ṣṭir bhramati Rāghava*

*paṣyāmi vṛkṣān sāuvarṇān Uṣīrakṣtamūrdhajān*

(B. 73. 15: *paṣyāmi vṛkṣān etāṅ ca sāuvarṇān iva sāmpratam*),

"My life-breath fails, my sight wanders, Rāghava; I see the golden trees of death" ("now I see those trees which, as it were, are golden"); which last, as the scholiast says, is the *marañacihnam* or 'sign of death.' Again, to connote the last extreme of folly, "Now, foolish one, thou seest many a golden tree."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> R. B. iii. 53. 47: *pādapān kāñcanān nūnaṁ bahūn paṣyasi durmate* (C. *man-dabdhāḥ*). Compare also the description in R. B. iv. 41. 47: *jālarūpamayāṁ vṛkṣāṁ puspitāṁ paricobhitam martukāmā narāḥ pūrvān tān paṣyanti mahi-*

But to leave these vaguer resemblances, there is enough of striking parallelism in the field of proverbs to merit attention. Themes of life, death and fate are favorites to the epic moralists, and it is not surprising that we should find the two poems touch each other here most closely. The first example I shall cite shows how (as in the *kaccit* chapter<sup>1</sup> Bharatarṣabha and Kāikeyīsuta interchange) the proverb is adapted to the particular epic in which it is embalmed. Thus M.<sup>2</sup> xi. 2. 23:

*na kālasya priyaḥ kaṣcin na dveṣyaḥ, Kurusattama,*

“Fate loves no one and hates no one, thou best of Kurus,” compared with R. B. iv. 18. 28:

*na kālasya priyaḥ kaṣcin na dveṣyo 'sti, Kapiṣvara,*

“Fate loves no one and hates no one, thou lord of apes.” The following remarks on the same subject (M. *kālaḥ pacati*, etc.) differ in each epic,<sup>3</sup> and in both the theme is often touched upon elsewhere. Compare, for example, R. B. vi. 8. 16: *pacaty eva yathā kālaḥ*; and M. xii. 229. 94: *na jātva akāle*, etc. One of these fatalistic proverbs, called in the Rāmāyaṇa a “*lokapravāda* of the Pundits,” is evidently at bottom the same with another in the Mahābhārata. Thus in R. v. 25. 12:

*lokapravādo satyo 'yaṁ paṇḍitāiḥ samudāhṛtaḥ  
akāle durlabho mṛtyuḥ striyā vā puruṣasya vā,*

“True is the Pundits' proverb: Death is not easy to attain till one's time comes,” which in B. 28. 3 is repeated in the form

*satyaṁ vaco yat pravādanti viprā nā 'kālamṛtyur bhavati 'ha loke,*

“True is the word the priests declare: No death untimely (i. e. at an hour not fated) happens here among men.” This is nothing but a restatement of M. xii. 25. 11 and xiii. 164. 10:

---

*dharam, jātārūpamayāṁs tāñ ca vivīdhāñs tatra pādapān, Uṣīravijō yāir juṣṭo Yamasyo 'ttaraṣarvataḥ.* The banana, which is sometimes called golden and is typical of death and decay, may have served as the starting-point of the metaphor. Compare R. C. vi. 61. 25: *pravṛddhaḥ kūñcano vṛkṣaḥ phalakāle nikṛṇtyate* (B. *na kṛtvā . . . nipātyate*).

<sup>1</sup> R. C. ii. 100. 27 and M. ii. 5. 44. A. J. P. XIX, p. 149.

<sup>2</sup> In this paper M. stands for Mahābhārata and R. (alone) for Rāmāyaṇa, Bombay edition (or expressly C.), as opposed to B., that is Gorresio's text.

They are indicated in Böhtlingk's *Spruch* 3194.

*nā 'kālato mriyate jāyate vā ; and  
nā 'prāptakālo mriyate (viddhaḥ),*

"Not untimely one dies or is born ; (even though wounded with an hundred arrows) one dies not if his time has not come." The phrase *duratikramaḥ kālaḥ*, in Purāṇa and Rāmāyaṇa alike, sums it all up ; for example, R. iii. 68. 21 = B. 73. 26 :

*so 'yam adya hataḥ śete kālo hi duratikramaḥ,*

"So here to-day he lies destroyed ; for the fated hour is hard to overcome." The same idea is expressed in the Mahābhārata, xiv. 53. 16 :

*na diṣṭam abhyatīkrāntuṃ śakyaṃ buddhyā balena vā,*

"Neither by intelligence nor by power can one overcome what is appointed." And the two epics unite verbally in the grand chorus of fatalism :

*dāivam eva paraṃ manye pāuruṣaṃ tu nirarthakam,*

"Fate alone I deem important ; useless is the toil of man."<sup>1</sup>

Occasionally a slight change in the reading occurs without in any way affecting the real identity of the proverb as found in both epics. In R. B. ii. 122. 17 ff. (a passage entirely wanting in C.) there is a pretty plain equivalent of Manu ix. 303 ff., in which the king is identified with various gods. The language here used shows unmistakable identity, though the list of gods in Manu is increased by one. It is not, however, this passage itself that is of chief interest, but its prototype, which is connected with it by the

<sup>1</sup> This proverb is found in this form M. ii. 47. 36 (with *ca* for *tu*) and R. i. 58. 22-23 = B. 60. 25. An alternate formula, *dhik pāuruṣam anarthakam*, *Spr.* 2974, occurs M. vii. 135. 1 and viii. 9. 3. The revolt against the fatalism of these proverbs is found philosophically elaborated in the Mahābhārata, where Luck and Fate as well as Nature and one's own ability are all repudiated as factors in determining events, and "the fruit of former actions" explains everything, M. iii. 32. 20 and elsewhere. The Rāmāyaṇa does not seem to employ the term *haṭha* (which is rendered 'Nothwendigkeit' in PW. and 'Zufall' in *Spr.* 5323) in its philosophical sense, unless the late verse B. v. 85. 11 be an exception, where *haṭhena* may be rendered 'by happy accident.' But the Mahābhārata also employs *haṭha* only in late passages. I may add that the proverb attributed in *Spruch* 1979 to the Agni Purāṇa (with the second hemistich *dāivaṃ puruṣakāreṇa ghnanti cūrāḥ sadodyamāḥ*) is already found in R. B. ii. 20. 8-9: *klībā hi dāivam evāi 'kaṃ praçaṇsanti na pāuruṣam, pratīpam api śaknōmi vyasanāyābhyupāgatam dāivaṃ puruṣakāreṇa pratiroddhum, arindama.*

*pāda* phrase *Yamasya Varuṇasya ca*. This formula (compare also *Manu* vii. 4) takes us back of the seven and eight forms of the king here recognized to the earlier identification with five forms, such as is found in *R.* iii. 40. 12 :

*pañca rūpāṇi rājāno dhārayanty amitāujasaḥ*  
*Agner Indrasya Somasya Yamasya Varuṇasya ca,*

“Kings whose power is unbounded are incorporations of five gods, Agni, Indra, Soma, Yama, and Varuṇa.” The corresponding passage in the *Gorresio* text, 44. 12, has *dhanadasya ca*, which apparently is an attempt to bring in a god belonging to another list, but the same text at iv. 17. 26 keeps the stereotyped *Varuṇasya ca*. Now, despite its different form this proverb must be the same with that implied in *M.* xii. 68. 41 :

*kurute pañca rūpāṇi kālayuktāni yaḥ sadā*  
*bhavaaty Agnis tathā 'dityo Mrtyur Vāiṣṭavaṇo Yamaḥ,*

“(The king), who assumes five incorporations of gods as given by Fate, becomes in turn Agni, Āditya, Mrtyu, Vāiṣṭavaṇa, and Yama.” This ending is also stereotyped, and the next advance is that of *M.* xii. 139. 103 :

*mātā pitā gurur goptā vahnir Vāiṣṭavaṇo Yamaḥ*  
*sapta rājño guṇān etān Manur āha Prajāpatiḥ,*

“These seven qualities of a king have been declared by Father *Manu*, namely, his identity with one's father, mother, teacher, protector, and with the gods Agni, Vāiṣṭavaṇa, and Yama, respectively.” Various as are the elaborated forms, each epic apparently knows a proverb on the king's “five forms.”<sup>1</sup>

Another group of five gives us a ritualistic proverb, which appears in the *Rāmāyaṇa* with the common device already spoken of, whereby a local vocative supplants part of the text. In *M.* xii. 141. 70 we read :

*pañca pañcanakhā bhakṣyā brahmakṣatrasya vāi viṣaḥ,*

“Five five-nailed animals are edible for a Brahman, Kṣatriya, and Vāiṣya.” But in the *Rāmāyaṇa* the Vāiṣya is omitted, in order to drag in the vocative *Rāghava*, thus :

*pañca pañcanakhā bhakṣyā brahmakṣatreṇa (-kṣatreṣu),*  
*Rāghava,*

<sup>1</sup> In *Spruch* 3863 the form in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is given.

"Five five-nailed animals are edible for a Brahman, and Kṣatriya, O Rāghava," R. iv. 17. 39; B. 16. 32.<sup>1</sup>

Proverbial phrases sometimes seem to be dramatically utilized. Thus in R. vi. 71. 63: *bālo 'yam iti vijñāya na cā 'vajñātum arhasi, bālāṁ vā yadi vā vṛddhāṁ mṛtyuṁ jānīhi māṁ raṇe* (so B., C. *saṁyuge*), we are irresistibly reminded of M. xii. 68. 40: *na hi jātū avamantavyo manuṣya iti bhūmipah*, and Manu vii. 8: *bālo 'pi nā 'vamantavyo manuṣya iti bhūmipah*; while *bālāṁ vā yadi vā vṛddham* (like many *vā yadi vā* phrases) is proverbial (*Spr.* 4448), and here put into *ad hominem* form.

I will now give what further identical proverbs I have found in the two epics. The variants are generally too slight to affect the sense,<sup>2</sup> though important as regards the relation of the texts.

*aṣvamedhasahasraṁ ca satyaṁ ca tulayā dhṛtam,*

M. i. 74. 103; xiii. 22. 14; R. B. ii. 61. 10. The next hemistich differs in all. R. is followed by general aphorisms on truth like M. xii. 199. 65. Compare also R. ii. 109. 10 ff.; *Spruch* 731.

*indriyāṇāṁ prasṛṣṭānāṁ hayānām iva vartmasu,*

etc., *Spruch* 1118; M. iii. 211. 25; R. vii. 59 (2). 23; B. 63. 23.

*guror apy avaliptasya kāryākāryam ajānataḥ  
utpathapratipannasya paritṛyāgo vidhiyate,*

M. v. 178. 48; *nyāyyaṁ bhavati ṣāsanam*, i. 140. 54; *daṇḍo bhavati ṣaṣvataḥ*, xii. 57. 7; *utpatham . . daṇḍo bhavati ṣāsanam*, xii. 140. 48; *kāryaṁ bhavati ṣāsanam*, R. ii. 21. 13; *kāmakāra-pravṛttasya na kāryaṁ bruvato vacaḥ*, R. B. ii. 22. 11. Only the first hemistich is the same, and even in M. the last *pāda* of the second is without fixed form. In M. this stanza is ascribed to

<sup>1</sup> Compare Manu v. 17-18. Just where proverb-literature meets didactic wisdom is not easy to determine. Thus R. B. v. 81. 37 ff. works out a *ṣāstra-viniṣṭaya* on the "four means," *sāma*, *upapradāna*, *bheda*, *daṇḍa*, which is later than the "three means" elsewhere recognized in the Rāmāyaṇa itself and in the Mahābhārata. See *Ruling Caste*, p. 182, note, and compare R. iv. 17. 29; B. 16. 22.

<sup>2</sup> Occasionally they change the sense considerably. Thus R. vi. 64. 7-8: *karma cāi 'va hi sarveṣāṁ kārāṇānāṁ prayojanam . . . adharmānarthayohḥ prāptāṁ phalaṁ ca prātyavāyikam*, becomes in B. 43. 7-8: *kāma eva hi . . . (and) adharmānarthayohḥ prāptiḥ phalaṁ vāi pratyavāyikam* (sic; this word appears to have found no place in the Lexicon).



Marutta; in R. to Manu. In M. punishment is inflicted on the good-for-nothing teacher; in R. B. only his advice may be ignored. In R. B. the verse is followed by

*daṣa viprān upādhyāyo gāuraveṇā 'tiricyate  
upādhyāyān daṣa pitā tathāi 'va vyatiricyate,*

etc., like M. xii. 108. 16; xiii. 105. 14-15; Manu ii. 145; *Sprüche* 2180 and 2726.

*na sā sabhā yatra na santi vṛddhāḥ,*

etc., *Spruch* 3483; M. v. 35. 58; R. vii. 59 (3). 33; B. 64. 33.

*bhartā vai dāivataṁ param,*

M. xii. 145. 4; *bhartā hi dāivataṁ strīṇām*, R. B. ii. 23. 4. Other forms of the same thought in R. B. are *bhartā strīṇām hi dāivataṁ*, i. 17. 16; *dāivataṁ hi patiḥ strīṇām*, ii. 38. 20 (compare ii. 68. 15, 42); *paramaṁ dāivataṁ patiḥ*, iii. 2. 23; 3. 2; v. 25. 11. For M. see *Ruling Caste*, p. 364, note. See also *Spruch* 4540 ff.

*yo hi dharmam samācṛitya,*

etc., *Spruch* 5663; M. v. 37. 16; R. B. v. 88. 17, with v. 1.

*mitam dadāti hi pitā,*

etc., *Spruch* 4848; M. xii. 148. 6-7; R. ii. 39. 30; B. 38. 25; iv. 20. 4.

*yathā kṣāṭhaṁ ca kṣāṭhaṁ ca . . . evaṁ putrāḥ ca pāutrāḥ ca,*

etc., *Spruch* 5093; M. xii. 174. 15-16; R. ii. 105. 26-27, with v. 1.; B. 114. 12. Part of the proverb (in shorter form) in M. xii. 28. 36.

*yasya ṣūrasya vikrāntāir edhante bāndhavāḥ sukham  
tridaṣā iva Śakrasya sādhu tasya 'ha jīvitam,*

M. v. 133. 44, compared with

*yasya pāuruṣam aṣṇanti mitrasvajanabāndhavāḥ  
amarā iva Śakrasya sapthalaṁ tasya jīvitam,*

R. B. v. 2. 36; *Sprüche* 5398 and 5383. This is perhaps the best example of proverbs couched in words so different as scarcely to unite verbally at all, and yet identical in sense and arrangement. "Noble on earth is the life of that hero whose relatives enjoy prosperity through his prowess, even as the thrice-eleven gods (do

through) Çakra's (prowess)"; and again, in the second version, "fruitful is the life of that man whose friends, family and relatives live on his valor, even as the immortals (do on) Çakra's (valor)."

*saṁphannaṁ goṣu saṁbhāvyam,*

etc., *Spruch* 6880; M. v. 36. 58; B. v. 88. 9; R. vi. 16. 9, v. 1.

*sarve kṣayāntā nicayāḥ,*

etc., M. xi. 2. 3, etc.; R. ii. 105. 16; B. 114. 3, etc., with v. 1. Repeated several times. See *Spruch* 6948.

*sulabhā puruṣā rājan satataṁ priyavādinaḥ,*

etc., *Spruch* 7131; M. v. 37. 15; B. iii. 41. 1; R. 37. 2, etc.

*hanti jātān ajātān ca hiraṇyā 'rthe 'nṛtaṁ vadan,*

M. v. 35. 34; *bhūmy arthe tv anṛtam vadan*, R. B. iv. 34. 15. Manu viii. 99 coincides with M. R. C. has only the *çatam aṣvānṛte* part, 34. 9; *Spruch* 7366.

*haraṇaṁ ca paraśvānām,*

etc., *Spruch* 7367; M. v. 33. 65; R. vi. 87. 23; B. 66. 26, v. 1.

Here are altogether twenty-odd separate proverbs which are nearly identical in the two epics.<sup>1</sup> I may add, moreover, that just as the Mahābhārata has a number of legal aphorisms which are found in Manu, so the Rāmāyaṇa has, in accordance with its smaller size, a less number of Manavic verses not found in the Mahābhārata; for example:

*rājabhīr dhṛtadaṇḍāḥ ca kṛtvā pāpāni mānavāḥ  
nirmalāḥ svargam āyānti santaḥ sukrīno yathā,*

R. iv. 18. 31; B. 17. 24, *dhṛtadaṇḍā ye; rājanirdhṛtadaṇḍās tu*, Manu viii. 318, where the oldest commentator has *rājabhīr dhṛta°* (v. l. *rājabhīḥ kṛta°*), as in the Rāmāyaṇa and Vas. xix. 45.

But apart from these isolated proverbs, there still remain certain groups or collections of proverbs, which form in both epics larger areas of contact. Thus a collection of proverbs on the virtue of wealth in M. xii. 8. 16 ff. is found again in R. vi. 83. 32 ff., with sundry additions, in the Rāmāyaṇa especially to the proverb *yasyā 'rthās tasya mītrāṇi*, which is here developed into three

<sup>1</sup> In most of them R. B. agrees better with M. than does R. C., either by absence of the proverb in C. or by readings in B. more closely parallel to M.

stanzas. The other proverbs in this collection are *arthebhyo hi, Spr.* 618; *arthena hi, Spr.* 617; *yasyā 'rthās, Spr.* 5409; *adha-nenā°, Spr.* 212 and 619; *dharmah kāmāṣ ca, Spr.* 3091; and *viṣeṣaṁ nā 'dhigacchāmi patitasyā 'dhanasya ca*, which last is found at the beginning of the group in M. xii. 8. 15, while in R. it stands with v. l. at the end, B. 62. 39, though the other proverbs follow the same order in both poems, with slight variations and additions in each version. In *dharmah kāmāṣ ca*, for example, every text differs from every other :

*dharmah kāmāṣ ca svargaṣ ca harṣaḥ krodhaḥ ṣrutam damaḥ  
arthād etāni sarvāṇi pravartante narādhipa*

is M. in text B. 8. 21, and

*dharmah kāmāṣ ca harṣaṣ ca dhṛtiḥ krodhaḥ ṣrutam madaḥ*

is the version in M. text C. 225 ; while R. C. 83. 39,

*harṣaḥ kāmāṣ ca darpaṣ ca dharmah krodhaḥ ṣamo damaḥ,*

gives quite a different list ; and R. B. 62. 37,

*dharmah kāmāṣ ca darpaṣ ca harṣaḥ krodhaḥ sukhaṁ vayaḥ  
arthād etāni sarvāṇi pravartante na saṁśayaḥ,*

adds new elements and extends the variants into the second hemistich (where the other versions are identical). Such a group as this incorporated as a whole into both epics argues a proverbial philosophy that had already attained to some literary elaboration ; while the striking difference in text in the individual verses seems to show that neither epic copies directly from the other. But a mere concatenation of dissyllabic virtues and vices, such as we have here, is most easily subject to modification at the tongue and hand of every transmitter, so that no positive conclusions may safely be drawn from such an example, which is chiefly instructive in emphasizing the rather rare fact of both epics containing the same proverbial material co-ordinated in the same way.

In Manu vii. 3 it is said that the Deity created a king to protect the world, since men were scattered in fear in all directions when destitute of a king, *arājake loke*. This phrase has become a peg to hang proverbs on and both epics give us chapters on 'kingless' peoples. That in the Rāmāyaṇa, ii. 67, B. 69, is a combination of Mahābhārata xii. 67 and 68, where the catch-words, instead of *nā 'rājake janapade*, as in R., are respectively *arājakeṣu rāṣṭreṣu*,

*rājā cen na bhavet*, and *yadi rājā na pālayet* (in xii. 49. 70, *arājake jīvaloke*), though they are not constant.<sup>1</sup> The order is about the same in R. C. and B. Keeping this as a norm :

R. B. 10, *nā 'rājake guroḥ ṣiṣyaḥ ṣṛṇoti niyataṁ hitam* ; M. 15. 42, *na preṣyā vacanaṁ kuryur na bālāḥ* ; M. 68. 18, *guruṁ kliṣṇīyur api*

R. 11, *arājake dhanam nā 'sti nā 'sti bhāryā 'py arājake*

B. 11, *svam nā 'sty arājake rāṣṭre puṁsām na ca paṇigrahaḥ*

M. xii. 68. 15 (compare 67. 12), *na dārā na ca putraḥ syān na dhanam na paṇigrahaḥ*

B. 12, *yajñaṣṭilā dvijātayaḥ . . dasyusaṅghāḥ prapīditāḥ* ; C. 13-14, *na satrāṇy anvāsate dāntāḥ . . na yajvanāḥ . . viśṛjanty āptadakṣiṇāḥ*

M. 67. 2, *dasyavo 'bhībhavanty uta* ; 68. 20, *loko 'yaṁ dasyusād bhavet* ; 68. 22, *na yajñāḥ saṁpravarteyur vidhivat svāptadak-ṣiṇāḥ* ; 68. 25 and 15. 39, *na saṁvatsarasatrāṇi tiṣṭheyuḥ*

R. C. 12, *nā 'rājake janapade kārayanti sabhāṁ narāḥ* (B. *janāḥ sabhāṁ*)

*udyānāni ca ramyāṇi hr̥ṣṭāḥ puṇyagr̥hāṇi ca* (B. *prapāḥ*)

15, *na . . prahr̥ṣṭāṇaṭanartakāḥ utsavāḥ ca samājāḥ ca* ; B. 17, *na vivāhāḥ ca vartante*

M. 68. 22-23, *na vivāhāḥ samājo vā . . na mathyeraṅḥ ca gargarāḥ ; ghoṣāḥ praṇāḥ gaccheyur yadi rājā na pālayet*<sup>2</sup>

R. B. 15, *vyavahārā na vartante dharmāḥ sajjanasevitāḥ*

M. 67. 3, *dharmo na vyavatiṣṭhate* ; 68. 17, *adharmāḥ pragṛhītaḥ syāt*

R. B. 16, *vedān nā 'dhīyate viprāḥ*

M. 68. 26, *brāhmaṇāḥ caturo vedān nā 'dhīyirāṇs tapasvinaḥ*

R. B. 17 ; M. 67. 12 ; 68. 22 (above) ; M. 15. 37, *na brahmacāry adhīyita . . na kanyo 'dvahanaṁ gacchet*

R. B. 18, *nā 'rājake janapade viṣvastāḥ kulakanyakāḥ alaṁkṛtā rājamārge kṛḍanti viharanti ca*

M. 68. 32, *striyaḥ cā 'puruṣā mārgaṁ sarvālaṁkārabhūṣitāḥ nirbhayāḥ pratipadyante yadi rakṣati bhūmipāḥ*

R. B. 19, *vicaranty akutobhayāḥ*

R. C. 18, *na . . dhanavantaḥ surakṣitāḥ ṣerate vivṛtadvārāḥ*

<sup>1</sup> M. xii. 15 and 67-68 are variations on the same theme. See below.

<sup>2</sup> Add R. C. 20-21, where the bells on the elephants and the *ghoṣa* of arms are mentioned in an elaboration of joys of peace without parallel in M.

- M. 68. 30, *vivṛtya hi yathākāmaṁ gṛhadvārāṇi śerate*  
*manuṣyā rakṣitā rājñā samantād akutobhayāḥ*  
 (akutobhayāḥ as ending in M. 68. 25 and 30; and R. B.  
 19 and 20).
- R. C. 22, *na . . vaṇijo dūragāmināḥ gacchanti kṣemam adhvā-*  
*nam bahupaṇyasamācitāḥ* (B. 21, v. 1.). Compare  
 M. ii. 5. 114.
- M. 68. 21, *na kṛṣir na vaṇikpathaḥ*
- R. C. 29, *yathā hy anudakā nadyaḥ . . agopālā yathā gāvāḥ* (B.  
*agopāḥ ca*)
- M. 68. 11-13, *yathā hy anudake matsyāḥ . . agopāḥ paçavo yathā*  
 R. B. 26, *vināṣam āpnoti talhā rāṣṭram arājakam*
- M. 68. 13, *evam eva vinā rājñā vinaṣyeyur imāḥ prajāḥ* (so 15. 30).
- R. B. 27, *haranti durbalānāṁ hi svam ākrāmya balānvitāḥ*  
 M. 68. 14, *hareyur balavanto 'pi durbalānāṁ parigrahān*  
 M. 49. 70, *arājake jīvaloke durbalā balavattarāḥ piḍyante*  
 R. B. 28, *arājake janapade durbalān balavattarāḥ*  
*bhakṣayanti nirudvegā matsyān matsyā ivā 'lpakān*  
 R. C. 31, *matsyā ivā janā nityaṁ bhakṣayanti parasparam*  
 M. 15. 30 and 67. 16, *jale matsyā ivā 'bhakṣyan durbalān bala-*  
*vattarāḥ*<sup>1</sup>
- Manu vii. 20, *ṣūle (jale) . . 'pakṣyan durbalān balavattarāḥ*  
 M. 67. 17, *parasparam bhakṣayanto matsyā ivā jale kṛṣān*  
 M. 68. 8, *prajā rājabhayād eva na khādanti parasparam* (so 15. 7).
- R. C. 32, *ye hi saṁbhinnamāryādā nāstikāḥ chinnasaṁṣayāḥ*  
*te 'pi bhāvāya kalpante rājadanānīḍitāḥ*  
 M. 15. 33, *ye 'pi saṁbhinnamāryādā nāstikā vedanindakāḥ*  
*te 'pi bhogāya kalpante danḍenā 'ṣu nīḍitāḥ*<sup>2</sup>  
 M. 15. 34, *danḍasya hi bhayād bhito bhogāyāi 'va pravartate*
- R. B. 30, *andhaṁ tama ive 'dam syān na prājñāyata kimcana*  
*rājā cen na bhavel loke vibhajan sādhrvāsādhunī*  
 M. 15. 32, *andhaṁ tama ive 'dam syān na prājñāyata kimcana*  
*danḍaḥ cen na bhavel loke vibhajan sādhrvāsādhunī*

<sup>1</sup> Compare M. 15. 20, *sattvāḥ sattvā hi jīvanti durbalāir balavattarāḥ*.

<sup>2</sup> Manu vii. 23, *te 'pi bhogāya kalpante danḍenāi 'va nīḍitāḥ*. Manu vii. 22, *danḍasya hi bhayāt sarvaṁ jagat bhogāya kalpate*.

M. 15. 7; 68. 10, *andhe tamasi majjeyur (yadi daṇḍo na pālayet,*  
15. 7), (*apaṇyantaḥ paraṣparam*, 68. 10)

R. B. 31, *dasyavo 'pi na ca kṣemaṁ rāṣṭre vindanty arājake*  
*dvāv ādadāte hy ekasya dvayoḥ ca bahavo dhanam*  
M. 67. 14, *pāpā hy api tadā kṣemaṁ na labhante kadācana*  
*ekasya hi dvāu harato dvayoḥ ca bahavo 'pare.*

These groups have apparently a common source, rather than a similitude based on copying.

Of some of the legends a few characteristic hall-marks will show the underlying unity. Thus in the account of the churning of the ocean, M. i. 18. 13:

*manthānaṁ Mandaraṁ kṛtvā tathā netraṁ ca Vāsukim*

of which the first three words are repeated in Hariv. 4603; while R. B. i. 46. 21,

*manthānaṁ Mandaraṁ kṛtvā netraṁ kṛtvā tu Vāsukim*

is identical (C. 45. 18 varies: *tato niṣcitya mathanaṁ yoktraṁ kṛtvā ca Vāsukim manthānaṁ Mandaraṁ kṛtvā mamanthur amitāujasaḥ*). B. here stands nearer to M.

The tale of Surabhi is inserted in R. ii. 74, B. 76, or rather this episode is inserted in R. for the sake of the tale, as the rest of the chapter is a mere repetition of what precedes. In M. iii. 9. 4 the story begins with

*paraṁ putrān na vidyate;*

in R. B. 76. 25,

*nā 'sti putrāt paraṁ priyam (putrasamo priyaḥ, C. 74. 24).*

In M. it is an *ākhyāna*, dramatic, 'Indra uvāca,' etc. Surabhi exclaims (9-10) *ahaṁ tu putraṁ ṣocāmi . . paṇyāi 'naṁ karṣakaṁ kṣudraṁ durbalaṁ mama putraṁ pratodenā 'bhiniḥnantaṁ lāṅgalena ca pīḍitam.* In R. B. 76. 23-24: *ahaṁ putrāu ṣocāmi . . . pratodaprabhinnāṅgāu . . . pīḍyamānau lāṅgalena karṣa-keṇa durātmanā.* Here too B. agrees better with M.

In the story of Nandinī we read,

R. i. 54. 10; B. 55. 10, *na tvāṁ tyajāmi śabale*

M. i. 175. 31, *na tvāṁ tyajāmi kalyāṇi.*

Just before this M. 23:

*hambhāyamānā kalyāṇī Vasiṣṭhasyā 'tha Nandinī  
āgamyā 'bhimukhī Pārtha tasthāu,*

like R. B. 55. 7 :

*Vasiṣṭhasyā 'grataḥ sthītvā hambhāravavirāviṇī*

(in C. 54. 7, *rudantī meghaniḥsvanā*). The phrase *Viṣvāmitrasya paçyataḥ*, R. 19, B. 18, is found (twice) in M. 40 and 41. Also M. 36, *yonideçac ca yavanān* = R. 55. 3 ; B. 56. 3 ; and ib. *çakṛd deçac çakāḥ smrtāḥ* in C., like *çakṛtaḥ çabarān bahūn* in M. Then M. 45, *dhig balaṁ kṣatriya-balaṁ brahmatejo balaṁ balaṁ*, and R. 56. 23, *dhig balaṁ kṣatriya-balaṁ brahmatejo balaṁ balaṁ* (also B.; compare R. 54. 14, *na balaṁ kṣatriyasā 'hur brāhmaṇā balavattarāḥ*), establish the identity of the two versions ; B. being a bit closer to M.

The identity of Hariv. 13809 ff. with R. vi. 58. 24 (B. 32. 20) ff. needs only a glance to establish, but as the specimen is very instructive of the method in which scenes were handed down it may be interesting to examine it somewhat in detail. The first *çloka* in H. is the third in R., but I shall transpose it to the third place for greater clearness of view<sup>1</sup> :

Rāmāyana.

*amṛṣyamāṇas (tat karma  
Prahasto ratham āçritaḥ)  
cakāra kadanāṁ ghorāṁ  
dhanuṣpāṇir (vanāukasām)  
āvarta iva saṁjajñe  
balasya mahato mahān (B)<sup>2</sup>  
kṣubitasyā 'prameyasya  
sāgarasye 'va saṁplave (B)<sup>3</sup>  
mahatā hi çarāughena  
(rākṣaso raṇadurmadaḥ)<sup>4</sup>  
ardayāmāsa saṁkruddho  
(vānarān paramāhave)  
(vānarānāṁ) çarirāis tu  
(rākṣasānāṁ) ca medinī  
babhūva nicitā<sup>5</sup> (ghorāiḥ)*

Harivaṇça.

*amṛṣyamāṇas (tridaçān  
āhavasthān udāyudhān)  
cakāra kadanāṁ ghorāṁ  
dhanuṣpāṇir (mahāsuraḥ)  
āvarta iva saṁjajñe  
balasya mahato mahān  
kṣubitasyā 'prameyasya  
sāgarasye 'va saṁplavaḥ  
mahatā ca balāughena  
(Anuhrādaḥ surottamam)  
ardayāmāsa saṁkruddho  
(Dhanādhyakṣaṁ pratāpavān)  
(tridaçānāṁ) çarirāiç ca  
(dānavānāṁ) ca medinī  
babhūva nicitā (sarvā)*

<sup>1</sup> The opening phrase of R., *amṛṣyamāṇas*, is a stock expression, e. g. R. vi. 67. 142 ; 69. 141, *amṛṣyamāṇas taṁ ghoṣam*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> C. here has *senayor ubhayos tadā*.

<sup>3</sup> C. *niḥsvanaḥ*.

<sup>4</sup> B. *Prahasto yudhi durmadaḥ*.

<sup>5</sup> So B.; C. has *babhūvā 'ticitā ghorāiḥ*.

<i>parvatāir iva saṁvṛtā</i> (C.) <sup>1</sup>	<i>parvatāir iva saṁvṛtā</i>
<i>(sā mahī rudhīrāugheṇa</i>	<i>(Meruprṣṭhaṁ tu raktena</i>
<i>prachannā)</i> <sup>2</sup> <i>saṁprakāṣate</i>	<i>rañjitaṁ) saṁprakāṣate</i>
<i>(saṁchannā) mādhave māsi</i>	<i>(sarvato) mādhave māsi</i>
<i>puṣpītāir iva kiṁṣukāiḥ</i> (B. 25a) <sup>3</sup>	<i>puṣpītāir iva kiṁṣukāiḥ</i>

The next five śloka are omitted in B. altogether. I give first the version of R. C. and then of M. in alternate hemistichs :

R.	<i>hatavirāughavaprāṁ tu bhagnāyudhamahādrumām</i>
H.	<i>hatāir virāir gajāir aṣvāiḥ prāvarlata mahānadi</i>
R.	<i>ṣoṇitāughamahātoyāṁ yamasāgaragāminīm</i>
H.	<i>ṣoṇitodā mahāghorā yamarāṣṭravivardhini</i>
R.	<i>yakṛtphīhamahāpaṅkāṁ vinikīrṇāntraṣāivalām</i>
H.	<i>ṣakṛnmedomahāpaṅkā viprakīrṇāntraṣāivalā</i>
R.	<i>bhinnakāyaṣirominām aṅgāvayavaṣādvalām</i>
H.	<i>chinnakāyaṣirominā hy aṅgāvayavaṣarkarā</i>
R.	<i>gr̥dhrahaṁsavarākīrṇāṁ kaṅkasārasasevitām</i>
H.	<i>gr̥dhrahaṁsagaṇākīrṇā kaṅkasārasanādinī</i>
R.	<i>medaḥphenasamākīrṇāṁ āvartasvananiḥsvanām</i>
H.	<i>vaṣāphenasamākīrṇā protkrusṭastanitasvanā</i>
R.	<i>tām kāpuruṣadustārām yuddhabhūmimayīm nadīm</i>
H.	<i>tām kāpuruṣadurdharṣām yudhabhūmimahānadīm</i>
R.	<i>nadīm iva ghanāpāye haṁsasārasasevitām</i>
H.	<i>nadīm ivā 'tapāpāye haṁsasārasaṣobhītām</i>
R.	<i>rākṣasāḥ kapimukhyās te terus tām dustarām nadīm</i>
H.	<i>tridaṣā dānavāḥ cāi 'va terus tām dustarām tadā</i>
R. 33, b.	<i>yathā padmarajodhvastām nalinīm gajayūthapāḥ</i>
H. 13818.	<i>yathā padmarajodhvastām nalinīm gajayūthapāḥ</i>

Rāmāyaṇa C. 34 and B. 25b.

Harivaṇṣa 13819.

<i>tataḥ srjantaṁ bāṇāughān</i>	<i>tataḥ srjantaṁ bāṇāughān</i>
<i>(Prahastaṁ) syandane sthitam</i>	<i>(Anuhrādaṁ) rathe sthitam</i>
<i>dadarṣa tarasā (Nilo</i>	<i>dadarṣa tarasā (devo</i>
<i>vinighnantam<sup>4</sup> plavaṅgamān)</i>	<i>nighnantaṁ yakṣavāhinīm)</i>

After this the resemblance is again with C. alone, though not very exact, for a few verses further. A phrase of H. 13825 in

<sup>1</sup> B. *patitāir iva parvatāiḥ*.

<sup>2</sup> B. *saṁchannā sma prakāṣate*.

<sup>3</sup> C. 28, *palāṣāir iva puṣpītāiḥ*.

<sup>4</sup> So B.; C. *vidhamantam*.



R. C. 40 and B. 28, *vavarṣa ṣaravarṣāṇi*, introduces a striking simile :

C. 41: *tasya bāṇaganān eva rākṣasasya durā'tmanaḥ  
apārayan vārayitum pratigṛhṇān nimilitaḥ  
yathāi 'va govṛṣo varṣaṁ ṣāradam ṣiḡhram āgatam  
evam eva . . . ṣaravarṣān . . . nimilitākṣaḥ sahasā . . . sehe.*

(B. 28: *tadyathā govṛso* etc. . . . *asahata* ; so H. 13826, *tadyathā  
ṣāradam varṣaṁ govṛṣaḥ . . . pratigṛhṇāti . . . evam eva  
. . . asahata*).

This simile belongs to R. It is found in B. iii. 32. 4 in a slightly different form and application. In C. ib. 26. 4, *pratigṛhya ca tad varṣaṁ nimilita iva 'rṣabhah*, the simile is united by *nimilita* with the present passage, which is not the case with B., though the latter has *ṣāradam* as here: *pratigṛhya tu tad varṣaṁ ghoram ṣatrunisūdanaḥ ṣāradam sthūlapṛṣataṁ ṣṛṅgābhyām govṛṣo yathā*.

With C. 43, B. 30, all resemblance with the Harivaṅṣa ceases till in C. 54, B. 41-42, the verse

*sa gatāsur gataṣṛiko gatasatvo gatendriyaḥ  
(papāta sahasā bhūmāu chinnamūla iva drumah)*<sup>1</sup>

recalls an entirely different passage of the Harivaṅṣa, viz. 3721 ff., where is found in the same connection the same unusual phrase :

*(kharah . . . papāta dharaṇitale)  
tam gatāsum gataṣṛikam vīkṣya, etc.*

The epic scholar will recognize many regular phrases in the passage given above. Such iterata are, for example, *cakāra kadanam ghoram, āvarta iva, mahatā hi ṣarāugheṇa, parvatāir iva saṁvṛtā, puṣpītāir iva kiṁṣukaiḥ*, and in the *balasāgara* (which is a commonplace of the epic), *yamarāṣṭravivardhini, vinikirṇān-ṭṣāivālā* (R. vi. 7. 20), etc.

<sup>1</sup> The words *papāta*, etc. are fixed phrases ; e. g. R. B. ii. 95. 2 :

*papāta sahasā bhūmāu mūlabhraṣṭa iva drumah*

B. iii. 26. 24 (compare M. viii. 96. 54) :

*chinnamūla iva drumāḥ* (C. *bhinna*°)

And the whole hemistich, B. ii. 74. 19 (v. l. in C.) :

*papāta sahasā bhūmāu chinnamūla iva drumah.*

In the story of Ahalyā<sup>1</sup> are related in R. i. 48 Ahalyā's temporary extinction and Indra's fate from the curse of Gāutama, *tvam viphalo bhava*, and the denouement (49. 8): *utpātya meṣavṛṣaṇāu sahasrākṣe nyaveṣayan* (or B., *utkrītya . . . Indrāyo 'padaduḥ*). According to one account in the Mahābhārata, Indra was not destroyed, although cursed by Gāutama for making love to Ahalyā.<sup>2</sup> In the bare allusion to his adultery elsewhere<sup>3</sup> no result of Indra's sins seems to be known, as it is simply said *Ahalyā dharṣitā pūrvam . . . jīvato bhartur Indreṇa*, with the reproachful addition *sa vaḥ kiṁ na nivāritaḥ* (addressed to the gods), and the statement that he had committed divers other wrongs and deceits. But in another passage the particular curse ascribed in the Rāmāyaṇa to Gāutama is attributed to Kauṣika, Ahalyā's husband according to the Śadviṇṇa Br., while Gāutama is credited only with making the god's hair turn yellow: *Ahalyā-dharṣaṇanimittaṁ hi Gāutamād dhariṣmaṣrutām Indraḥ prāp-taḥ; Kauṣikanimittaṁ ce 'ndro muṣkaviyogaṁ meṣavṛṣaṇatvaṁ cā 'vāpa*.<sup>4</sup> The former legend does not appear in the Rāmāyaṇa. In the epithet *sahasranayana*, common to the two epics, may possibly lie in the Rāmāyaṇa the implication of the explanation (= *sahasramuṣka*) given in the Mahābhārata xiii. 34. 26 ff.:

*yathā mahārṇave kṣiptā sītāneṣṭur<sup>5</sup> vinaṣyati  
tathā duṣcaritaṁ sarvaṁ parābhāvāya kalpate  
paçya candre kṛtaṁ lakṣma samudro lavaṇodakaḥ  
tathā bhagasahasreṇa mahendraḥ paricikṣitaḥ<sup>6</sup>  
teṣāṁ eva prabhāvena sahasranayano<sup>1</sup> hy asāu  
çatakratuḥ samabhavat,*

that is: Every wrong committed against the priestly caste makes for destruction, even as a clod of earth is destroyed when thrown into a flood. For example, the spots on the moon and the salt of

<sup>1</sup> Compare Oertel on *Indrasya kilbiṣāṇi* in JAOS. XIX, pp. 118 ff.

<sup>2</sup> xiii. 154. 6: *atha çaptaç ca bhagavān Gāutamenā Purandaraḥ Ahalyāṁ kāmāyāno vāi dharmārthaṁ ca na hiṁsitaḥ*.

<sup>3</sup> M. v. 12. 6. Holtzmann in ZDMG. XXXII; Oertel, loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup> M. xii. 343. 23. Compare the rare epithet *meṣāṇḍa*, R. B. vii. 38. 29.

<sup>5</sup> C. *leṣṭuḥ* (*pāṇsupiṇḍaḥ*).

<sup>6</sup> xiii. 41. 21: *na tan manasi sthitam Gāutamenā 'si yan mukto bhagāṅka-paricikṣitaḥ*. Ahalyā is mentioned once more, xiv. 56. 28.

<sup>7</sup> R. C. vii. 72. 8: *sa Rāmaṁ mantrimadhyasthaṁ paçyann amaramadhyasthaṁ sahasranayanaṁ yathā*.

the sea (were caused by the righteous anger of priests). On the other hand, their power is so great that when Indra was marked with a thousand *bhaga* marks (through a priest's wrath) they alone turned these marks into eyes, so that Indra became "Thousand-eyed." But as an entirely different explanation given elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata*, i. 211. 27-28, refers the thousand orbs to admiration of *Tilottamā*, which forced out eyes on the god's body :

*mahendrasya 'pi (draṣṭukāmasya) netrāṇāṃ prsthataḥ pārṣvato*  
*'grataḥ*

*raktāntānāṃ viçālānāṃ sahasraṇ sarvato 'bhavat*  
*(tathā sahasranetraḥ ca babhūva balasūdanaḥ),*

it is doubtful of which legend the *Rāmāyaṇa* has cognizance. The epithet may of course be without implication of either legend, like its equivalent *sahasrākṣa*. All that appears certain is that both epics preserve the older feature of the ram-story, while in the account of *Ahalyā*'s discomfiture and long suppression there is a later phase of the tale, recounted in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Kathāsaritsāgara*, but not alluded to in the *Mahābhārata*.

I must leave for another time the discussion of the identical passages in *Harivaṇṣa* 13666 ff., R. vi. 44; *Hariv.* 12825 ff., R. iv. 40; M. i. 66, R. iii. 14.

WASHBURN HOPKINS.